control data according to said business rules; and wherein

all three of said program instruction means are recorded on said medium.

REMARKS

Corrected drawings are provided in response to the Examiner's objection.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, and 19 are amended to specifically point out that the modeled database is the common database 110 as described in the specification page 7 lines 16 - 20 and page 6 line 7 - page 7 line 3. The common database is also shown in FIG. 1. Such amending is made along with the corrected drawings to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 19 are amended above to require developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building the rules into a common database. Support is found in the specification page 6 line 8 - page 7 line 3.

The present invention concentrates on the business control data and finding common business data across multiple applications. The common data is managed by a single application performing the steps of e.g. claim 1. The sole purpose of this application is to manage the common data in one database (the common database) following the model of business rules which span a plurality of applications, then distributing according to these rules that data to the other business areas to be used by their respective applications.

In contrast, Iyengar describes taking different types of modeling tools and combining their outputs. For example, use Rational Rose (a modeling tool) and Erwin (another modeling tool). Take the best or parts of their outputs and combine. The present invention is not dependent on modeling tools, and does not try to integrate such tools. Instead, the present invention finds common business control data across multiple applications and then integrates that data into the multiple applications.

Nor does Souder describe developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications. Instead, Souder describes a distributed processing system in which a transaction may be distributed over several nodes. Modules are assigned to nodes and data is transferred from one module e.g., the output, to another e.g., the input, according to interdependency information. There is no description of developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and then disseminating business control data according to the business rules as required by applicants' independent claims 1, 10, and 19.

Applicants' claims as amended above are therefore allowable over Iyengar and Souder and the combination thereof. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of

providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 09/09/04

By: John Pivnichny

John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119